

REMARKS

A non-final Office Action was issued in the present application on January 6, 2009. In light of the above amendments and remarks herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the application and all presently pending claims.

By the present Amendment, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 5, 16, 20, 31 and 32 as discussed below. No new matter has been added.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections

With regard to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 16 to positively recite a first client device (i.e., machine), which is sufficient structural language to meet the requirements for patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Support for the claim language added can be found in the drawings and claims as originally filed, as well as page 3, lines 19-22 and page 6, lines 20-22 of the application as originally filed. Applicant submits that claims 1 and 16 and the dependent claims therefrom are thus in conformance with 35 U.S.C. § 101 and that the rejection of these claims based thereupon is traversed.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections

Claims 5 and 20 have been amended to reflect proper dependency from their respective independent claims, and thus Applicant submits that this rejection has been traversed.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections

In the Office Action dated January 6, 2009, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-35 under 35 USC § 102(b) based on U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0093346 to Weber (hereinafter "Weber").

Applicant reiterates its arguments from its October 16, 2008 response regarding the deficiencies Applicant perceives in the rejection of independent claims 1-35. Applicant further submits that the additional amendments to claims 1, 16, 31 and 32 further distinguish the present invention from the cited art. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, on pages 9 through 11 of the original application as filed.

Specifically with regard to independent claims 1, 16 and 31, Applicant has claimed a management component as one element of the invention, wherein the management component *includes a personalization component for creating and personalizing secondary application-related information based on said primary application-related information* and further a communications component for providing the secondary application-related information to the *first user type member*. Against these elements, the examiner has cited Weber's abstract, and elements of paragraph 0023

and paragraph 0044. However, nothing in these cited portions of Weber discloses the invention as claimed. The abstract is the only cited portion of Weber that even includes the term "personalized" but only refers to personalizing a user file "with information electronically obtained and verified from outside sources." There is nothing in the cited portions of Weber that discloses providing secondary application-related information *to the first user type member* (e.g., the applicant).

Further with regard to claims 1, 16, 31 and 32, Applicant has claimed a communications component for providing the secondary application-related information to the first user type member and for communicating primary application-related information *to a pre-determined member of a second user type*. Against this element, the examiner has cited paragraph 0015, lines 3-5, paragraph 0050 and claim 7 of Weber. However, such citations only refer to standard communications and relaying of messages. There is nothing in these or other portions of Weber related to pre-determining a member of a second user type (e.g., admissions application reviewer) for receipt of primary application-related information.

Further, with regard to the amendments to claims 1, 16, 31 and 32, Applicant has claimed that the second user-type member is *pre-determined via the management component based on the primary application-related information*. Against these claims, the examiner has cited portions of paragraphs 0024 and 0041 of Weber. However, these portions of Weber only indicate that information submitted by a financial aid applicant is reviewed. The cited portions are set out below:

Information obtained is then preferably reviewed to determine whether a student is eligible or ineligible for certain types of financial aid" (Weber, paragraph 0024, lines 14-16)

Once all required information for a student's file is received, the student financial aid processing center begins an extensive and particular process of reviewing a student's file. Preliminary review establishes verification of required documents, and quality control assures that established criteria are met for each reviewed student. (Weber, paragraph 0041, lines 20-26)

Applicant submits that there is nothing at all in these cited portions that pertains to pre-determining a second user type member based on the primary application related information. The Examiner's contentions in response to Applicant's previous response, on page 14 of the Office Action, are respectfully deemed moot in view of the present amendment whereby the pre-determination is made via the management component.

The prior art must show *all* claim elements in order to find anticipation or obviousness, and *all* words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art (see *Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP)* §§ 706.02(j) and 2143.03). Weber does not show the elements claimed and specified above. Applicant thus submits that all of these claims are allowable, and that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable based upon being dependent from an allowable independent claim.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that the present application is in position for prompt adjudication and allowance. Applicant believes that all of the claims

currently pending in the present application are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the address and phone number provided below.

A petition for 3-month extension of time is accompanying this response. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0766 in payment of any required fees, but with the exception of the issue fee.

Respectfully submitted,
WILLIAMS MULLEN, PC



Thomas F. Bergert
Counsel for Applicant
Reg. No. 38,076

Filed: July 3, 2009
Attached: Petition for 3-month extension of time

Thomas F. Bergert, Esq.
Williams Mullen, PC
8270 Greensboro Drive, Suite 700
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-5200
tbergert@williamsmullen.com
6566270